

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The two attached sheets include changes to Figs. 4 and 11. The first sheet, which includes Fig. 4, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 4. The changes consist of adding reference numbers 6, 24 and 37. The second sheet, which includes Fig. 11, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 11. The changes consist of adding reference numbers 50 and 54 in accordance with the written description.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the phone conference on June 15, 2009, with examiner Tran wherein Applicants' representative, Mark Joy, and examiner Tran discussed the "priority" and "filing date" of the present application in view of the Office Action's reliance on references that have 102(e) dates that are *after the priority date* of the present application (April 1, 2003). Applicants' representative directed Examiner Tran's attention to the presence, in the file wrapper of the present application, of (1) a *certified priority document (the EPO application)* and (2) a *claim of priority to the EPO application (filed on April 1, 2003) in the Combined Declaration and Power of Attorney executed by the inventors*. Applicants' representative also noted that the EPO application, the subsequently filed PCT application (upon which the present application is based), and the presently pending US application all appear to have the same specification and drawings. The current Office Action does not state that the presently pending claims fail to meet the disclosure requirements under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, paragraph 1. Thus, Applicants previously perfected a claim of priority to the EPO application filed on April 1, 2003.

Remarks in Response to the Office Action

The Examiner is requested to approve the accompanying replacement drawings. The changes to the drawings include adding reference numbers to FIGs. 4 and 11 in accordance with the missing reference numbers identified by the Office Action.

Claims 17, 19-28 and 40-44 were previously pending and currently stand rejected. Applicants have reviewed the grounds for rejecting the claims in the Office Action dated December 15, 2008, and the references cited therein. Applicants have amended the claims to address the claim rejections. New dependent claim 45 has been added.

Applicants request favorable reconsideration of the Office Action's grounds for rejection in view of Applicants' amendments to the previously pending claims and the Remarks provided herein. Please charge any fee deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 12-1216.

Applicants, herein below, address the issues raised in the Office Action in their order of appearance.

Priority of the Presently Pending Application/Claims

Section 6 of the Office Action acknowledges receipt of Applicants' priority document from the EPO, but does not apply the filing date (April 1, 2003). Applicants have reviewed the previously submitted priority claim and Applicants' EPO priority application (filed on April 1, 2003) upon which the priority claim (in the submitted Combined Declaration and Power of Attorney executed by the inventors) is based. The specification and claims of the present application contain the same disclosure as the EPO application (certified copy previously filed in the USPTO) from which priority is claimed (in a Combined Declaration/Power of Attorney executed by the inventors). Moreover, the Office Action does not reject any of the presently pending claims under Section 112, paragraph 1. Applicants submit that the **claim of priority to the EPO application filed on April 1, 2003, has been perfected and any rejections based on applications/patents filed after April 1, 2003, have been successfully overcome.**

Drawing Objections

The Office Action identifies certain missing reference numbers in the drawings. Applicants have amended the drawings to include the missing reference numbers in FIGs. 4 and 11. The replacement drawings are attached hereto. Applicants note that reference number 16 is already present in FIG. 4. Moreover, FIG. 4 is amended to include reference numbers 24 and 37. However, these elements best viewed in FIG. 3 that provides a plan view of the structures containing the elements 24 and 37.

Claim Objections

Applicants acknowledge the numbering error identified in page 4 of the Office Action. Applicants acknowledge the correction to the claim numbering and have amended claim 28 to address the claim numbering error.

Summary of the Rejections

1. Claims 17, 19-28 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 2, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.
2. Claims 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 40, 41 and 43 are rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Nako et al. US Pat. Serial No. 6,788,292 (Nako).
3. Claims 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 43 and 44 are rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Aoki et al. US Pat. App. Pub. US 2005/0110702 (Aoki).
4. Claims 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, and 40-44 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Miyashita US Pat. Serial No. 6,327,482 (Miyashita) in view of Olodort et al. US Pat. App. Pub. US 2005/0091431.

Applicants traverse the grounds for each and every rejection for at least the reasons set forth herein below. Applicants address the specific rejections in the order they arise in the Office Action.

Rejection of Claims 17, 19-28 and 40-44 as Failing to Particularly Claim the Invention

Applicants traverse each of the rejections under Section 112, paragraph 2, in view of Applicants' amendments and the reasons provided herein.

(A) Claim 17 "different kind"

Applicants have deleted the "different kind" limitation from claim 17. Applicants traverse the rejection since the use of the phrase "different kind" to define differences between two distinct panels on the claims panel device. The "different kinds" of panels are described, by way of example, at page 5, lines 8-18. Examples of different kinds of panels include: touch panels, keyboard panels, display screens, display size, different technologies, different number of lines, columns. Nevertheless, this rejection is rendered moot by Applicants' deletion of "different kind" from claim 17.

(B) Claim 17 "such as"

Applicants do not understand the rejection since the term "such as" was not previously used in claim 17. There are clear differences between "such as", which recites a potential example, and "such that" which states a consequence arising from a recited element.

(C) Claim 25 "further axis"

Applicants have addressed the rejection by replacing "further" by "second" to distinguish between the two distinct recited axes in claims 24 and 25. Applicants have also added new claim 45 that depends from claim 19 in a manner similar to the relationship between claims 24 and 25.

(D) Claim 25 "first axis"

Applicants have remedied the identified problem by having claim 25 depend from claim 24 that recites the intended first instance of "first axis."

(E & F) "different kind of application" and "different technologies"

Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the claims are directed to devices displaying at least two different kinds of applications and at least two different technologies, respectively.

Rejection of Claims 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 40, 41 and 43 as Anticipated by Nako

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 40, 41 and 43 over Nako. Nako does indeed disclose a device including two panels. However, neither of the two panels includes Applicants now recited (*see*, amended claim 17) "connection means enabling coupling and uncoupling a housed one of the two panels" to facilitate replacement of the panel.

Each of the dependent claims is patentable for the reasons set forth herein above for claim 17 from which each depends. Applicants reserve the right to argue the separate patentability of the dependent claims, if needed, at a later time.

Rejection of Claims 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 43 and 44 as Anticipated by Aoki

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 40, 43 and 44 over Aoki. As an initial matter, Aoki is not even prior art to the presently pending claims that are entitled to a priority date of April 1, 2003. Moreover, Aoki does not disclose or suggest interchangeably mounting a panel within a sub-housing.

Each of the dependent claims is patentable for the reasons set forth herein above for claim 17 from which each depends. Applicants reserve the right to argue the separate patentability of the dependent claims, if needed, at a later time.

Rejection of Claims 17, 19-20, 24-26, and 40-44 as Obvious Over Miyashita in View of Olodort

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 17, 19-20, 24-26, and 40-44 over Miyashita in view of Olodort. As an initial matter, Olodort is not even prior art to the presently pending claims that are entitled to a priority date of April 1, 2003. Miyashita discloses a mounted flat display that is incorporated into an interchangeable housing. The display panel of Miyashita, permanently encased within its housing, is neither foldable nor rollable. The panel disclosed in Miyashita cannot be uncoupled from a connection means of a sub-housing of the panel device's housing. Moreover, Olodort, which is not prior art, neither discloses nor suggests the claimed connection means that facilitates replacement of at least one of the two panels.

For the reasons set forth herein above regarding claim 17, Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 19-20, 24-26, and 40-44 over the combined teachings of Miyashita and Olodort. Applicants reserve the right to argue the separate patentability of the dependent claims, if needed, at a later time.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Joy, Reg. No. 35,562
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 15, 2009